DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 378 637 EA 026 323

AUTHOR Hammiller, Ruth E.; Capper, Colleen A.
TITLE The Principal's Role in Neighborhood-Based Interagency Collaboration: A Peripheral and Flexible Link.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Agency Cooperation; Community Coordination; *Cooperative Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *Principals; School Community Programs; *School Community Relationship; Social Services

ABSTRACT

Community-based interagency collaboration may allow agencies to more effectively involve residents and create a preventive, proactive social-service delivery system. This paper presents findings of a study that investigated the role of principals in community-based interagency collaboration (CBIC) in a large midwestern city. The project was initiated by top administrators in the four participating agencies--police, social services, schools, and public health. Interviews were conducted with a total of 36 individuals--9 principals and assistant principals, 3 district administrators, 17 interagency team members, 2 parent-school liaisons, and 5 top-level agency administrators. Observations were also conducted at all interagency team meetings. Findings indicate that principals were generally supportive of the project despite their exclusion from its formative stages. The principals responded to the project implementation in four ways: (1) by ignoring the project; (2) by offering encouragement and support; (3) by interacting with neighborhood team members; and (4) by concentrating increased efforts on improving and coordinating the school's internal environment. A majority of them were unable to articulate the link between the CBIC and the schools. In contrast with the active role generally played by principals in school-based collaboration, these principals were less involved and responsible as CBIC participants. Finally, CBIC has the potential to create a sense of community, provide an outreach role for the principal, and facilitate school reform. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 378 637

The Principal's Role in Neighborhood-based Interagency Collaboration: A Peripheral and Flexible Link

Ruth E. Hammiller, Doctoral Student

Colleen A. Capper, Assistant Professor

Department of Educational Administration

University of Wisconsin-Madison

1186D Educational Sciences Building

1025 West Johnson Street

Madison, WI 53706

608-263-9994

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, April 4-8, 1994, New Orleans, LA.

Running Head: Principal's Role in Interagency Collaboration

EA 026 323

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. E. Hammiller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE IN NEIGHBORHOOD-BASED INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION: A PERIPHERAL AND FLEXIBLE LINK

Coordination of services is increasingly being viewed as vital to rethinking service delivery to children and families. However, school-linked services are still experimental and little research has been conducted. Historically, most services have been school-based (Future of Children, 1992). These school-based programs to date (a) have little resident involvement, (b) are still case management based, (c) are targeted at coordinating line staff, and (d) are focused on dealing with families in a top-down fashion (i.e., picking certain families with whom to work) (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Heath & McLaughlin, 1987; Schorr, 1988). Evidence of interagency collaboration efforts based within the community rather than within the school is scant. Community-based interagency collaboration may allow agencies to more effectively involve residents and create a preventive, proactive manner of delivering services.

I have studied one neighborhood/community-based interagency collaboration effort in a large midwestern city since April of 1992. A neighborhood interagency team was formed in the Walnut Grove (WG) and Kennedy Manor (KM) (pseudonyms) neighborhoods to serve as a clearinghouse, and provider and coordinator of direct services, with a focus on prevention. The neighborhoods were targeted because they had one of the highest concentrations of low-income people of color, and the highest crime rate in the city. Team members included a representative of the police department (neighborhood officer), school district (school social worker), human services (social worker), and public health (nurse). The teams began meeting in March, 1992 and began meeting weekly in the neighborhoods in October of 1992.

This paper is part of a larger study about the progress and outcomes of this collaborative effort. Originally, I wished to explore the role and perspectives of the principal in neighborhood-based collaboration. I believe that the two are intertwined, as perspectives will influence what role a principal will assume. However, due to space constraints, the perspectives of the principal is the subject of another paper. First, I frame my study with the relevant literature.

Principals historically have not been trained in collaborative leadership and shared decision making with other community agencies. Jehl and Kirst (1992), however, believe that these skills are essential to establish school-linked services. The authors also advocate four other roles of the principal: (a) an active participant, (b) an advocate for an expanded school role, (c) a reorganizer who links key staff with other agency staff members, and (d) an enabler to promote staff involvement.

Some authors have studied the constraints principals have encountered while trying to promote outreach in the community. Leiter (1983) found that as a principal's role changed from that of an internal manager to that of a boundary spanner (i.e., reaching out to the community versus only conducting business within the school walls), teachers experienced costs in lack of coordination and leadership within the school. Although the boundary spanning role allowed the principal to increase effectiveness in the community, it also created a disruption of support and cooperation within the school that seemed to accompany increased community dissatisfaction; the principal was caught in a Catch-22.

Smylie, Crowson & Hare (1993, 1992) found similar double binds for principals in a school-based collaboration effort. The addition of service coordination and the associated increased personnel operating within the schools led to greater

complexities and ambiguities in maintaining in-school cooperation for the principal. Principals were expected to respond to new projects while simultaneously trying to maintain stability through traditional means. Additionally, principals have guarded the school from outside interruptions, but service-coordination and decentralization initiatives "attempt to open new doors and create greater community access to schools" (1993, p. 9). The authors found that principals responded to these challenges in three ways. According to Smylie, Crowson & Hare:

> First, principals, in varying degrees, compartmentalized and isolated the project from routine school functions. Second, they engaged in entrepreneurial behavior, treating the project as a reservoir of resources for their schools. Finally, principals evoked a wide range of control mechanisms to influence project implementation. Each of these responses aimed at satisficing, at striking an acceptable compromise among demands of the coordinated services project, the goals and demands of the school, and key stakeholder groups in the school community (1993, p. 10-11).

Valverde (1988) stresses the need for principals to create a "cultural climate that mirrors the communities" (p. 322). Principals do this by learning about the various cultures, increasing their teacher's knowledge and understanding the various cultures they serve, by coming in regular contact with diverse students, and by influencing students and teachers directly through controlling the physical environment. Valverde believes that creating a school climate that reflects the culture of the students is "central to holding minority students in school and to promoting learning" (p. 324).

Denton (1987) advocates for principals becoming community leaders, leaving the traditional boundaries of the school building. Denton outlines a community leadership process that includes agenda setting, participation mobilization, resource integration and collaborative management.

Bringing these ideas together, Zeldin (1990) discusses the need for the principal to establish the tone for collaboration that uses modeling, incentives and evaluation of teachers to increase teachers' skills in working with parents. Principals need to provide staff time to carry out shared decision making with parents and this may be necessary before teachers and parents can form sustained partnerships. School policy needs to then support the principal. Sarason also points to the fact that the principal is increasingly involved with services that are beyond their personal knowledge and expertise and, "because they [outside services] are not administratively under his or her jurisdiction, complicate problems with leadership, responsibility, and power " (p. 162).

To provide a framework to address the principal's role, Fullan's work on change will be used. Specifically, the paper will concentrate on the initiation and implementation phases of change in relationship to the principal's role in each phase. Due to the short duration of the project's existence, only the first two phases are applicable at this time.

Fullan (1991) provides a simplified overview of the change process, in four phases. Movement from one phase to the next is not necessarily a linear process, but events in one phase may feed back or alter decisions made in previous stages. Fullan suggests that the change process is not a smooth one, but a "snarled process. ...there are numerous factors operating at each phase" (p. 48). According to Fullan:

> Phase I, variously labeled initiation, mobilization, or adoption, consists of the process that leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change. Phase II, implementation or initial use (usually the first two or three years of use), involves the first experiences of attempting to put an idea or reform into practice. Phase III, called continuation, incorporation, routinization, or institutionalization, refers to whether the change gets built in as an ongoing part of the system or disappears by way of a decision to discard or through attrition (pp. 47-48). Phase IV involves examining the outcomes of the effort.

In sum, although the principal is a vital key in the success of any project involving the school, a variety of constraints interfere with the principal's effectiveness to use interagency collaboration as an impetus for school reform. Examples of interagency collaboration efforts housed in the community versus the schools are missing in the literature. This study will add to the knowledge base about how principals view their roles in neighborhood-based interagency collaboration.

Research Questions

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the roles of principals in neighborhood-based interagency collaboration. In this paper, two specific research questions are addressed:

1. What role did the principal take in this community-based interagency effort, and how did principals view their role related to community-based interagency efforts in the future?
2. How did the principal respond to or initiate change as a result of community-based interagency collaboration?

Methodology

Qualitative methods guided the data collection. I focused on the eight schools who had students from the two targeted neighborhoods (one school ignored the request for an interview and have ignored the project). I interviewed nine principals and assistant principals associated with the project, 3 district level administrators, 17 interagency team members in the two neighborhoods (which included neighborhood residents), 2 parent-school liaisons, and 5 top-level administrators associated with the other three agencies involved, totaling 36 interviews. I also gathered observation data

at all the interagency team meetings in each neighborhood. A total of 161 meetings, over 18 months, were observed, totaling 322 hours of observation data.

Analysis

I used a combination of constant comparative and analytic inductive method of data analysis. That is, I first identified preliminary research questions, then coded the field/observation notes of the meetings based on these questions. Through this analysis emerged additional questions, and a few initial questions receded in importance, based on this data. I then grouped coded responses according to their associated questions. I also noted emerging themes and coded the data accordingly. A similar procedure was then applied to the interviews. All but two of the interviews were taped and transcribed and detailed field notes were completed for each interview. I then used the constant comparative method within these groupings to determine relevant themes.

Findings and Discussion

In the findings, I first consider the principal's role in initiation and implementation of the project as well as what principals believed their role should be in the future. Second, I consider how the principals responded to or initiated school change and principals' beliefs regarding how schools should change in the future. Finally, conclusions will be drawn from the data regarding implications for changes in administrator preparation and school reform.

Principal's Role

Initiation

The idea of initiating a neighborhood-based interagency collaboration project stemmed from top-level administrators from the four agencies involved (i.e., police,

social services, schools and public health). Information gleaned from front line staff and administrators' observations generated discussions about the inadequacy of current service delivery, that resulted in duplication and fragmentation of services to a population that was served by all four agencies. Because top-level administrators recognized the problem but had no solutions, front line staff were given the assignment of beginning to work together with designated families to find a more efficient way of working. Top-level administrators believed that front line staff had more expertise, through direct experiences with residents, to find effective ways of working together.

Principals, as middle managers in schools, had little to do with the initiation of the community-based interagency collaboration project (CBIC). Principals did not serve on the teams and were not notified of the project's initiation until principals were told to place staff on the teams. In fact, the middle managers in all of the agencies seemed to have been left out of the process. However, middle managers provided background support during the implementation phase of the project. Five of the eight schools were told by central office administration to have someone from the school participate on the CBIC teams, three from the Kennedy Manor (KM) area and two from the Walnut Grove (WG) area (pseudonyms). Four of the five schools maintained participation and those individuals, including principals, were both excited and supportive of the project. However, central office administrators were clearly in charge, based on one principal's response:

> I think the initial support [from central office administration] was from a philosophy perspective was.....to say yes we hear you and there is a need there; so from that sense [the presence of support was there] very much so. And again I know the individuals in the central administration that kind of have been involved in this are aware of what's going on and stay tuned in and have a communication procedure set up so they get feedback.

When asked if future meetings would include principals with central office administrators, principals did not see that happening. When asked if any meetings with central office staff had occurred with the principals, one response was the following:

> Well, if they have been I haven't been part of them. Initially, there was some of that--we had a very large meeting at the United Way.....that was last year. There is a potential at this point in time for some central office realignment as far as responsibilities and if that happens that might precipitate a need to hold those people together [principals and school staff], particularly if somebody else gets involved who hasn't been all along.

Thinking by top-level administrators was to keep the teams fairly small, so not all schools were directed to have school personnel participate. One school team member discontinued team membership for about a year after participating in the initial meetings because he was uncomfortable with confidentiality issues. However, once the teams had begun the implementation phase of the project, and the project had received more political support from both the city and county, the school encouraged all schools involved to have some member of their school staff participate (Field Notes, Oversight Committee, June, 16, 1993).

Three divergent thoughts from principals sprang from the directive to have staff from all schools participate in the project. The first was that some principals were not happy that their school people had not been included from the beginning: "it might have been more helpful from our point of view.....[if] someone from the school had been at these meetings for the community [CBIC] to see us, to know us in that respect...". In fact, this same WG principal did not know about the existence of the KM team.

Second, some principals were dissatisfied with how the project was initiated and disappointed with the lack of direction given to their staff [and to the principals

themselves] who were told to participate. Hence, there was a reluctance to get involved and relinquish precious time within the school. As one principal put it:

> I think that basically we were told that we should have a representative. I don't think they did a very good job of explaining to all of the representatives what they were trying to do. I think the school system just joined it and didn't really set everybody down and explain to them what the participation was going to be.

Third, some principals refused to do the project as an "add-on" to an already overburdened staff. The principals believed that ownership needed to be established first, versus simply ordering staff to attend meetings. Relatedly, to build community ownership for the CBIC project, principals believed that the appropriate team members from a school should include a resident from a school-related organization, such as the Parent Teachers' Organization, and a faculty member. One principal said:

> It all comes back to that thing that if the person goes away then the program goes away. That can't happen. That's the biggest reason for failure on a lot of different things that i've observed...One of the biggest mistakes that [I have] made all the way through my career is that--OK, I'll go. Now its read as [the principal] will always do it or its read as just the opposite... [the principal] talks about wanting to build this collaboration type of thing but he's the only one who is going to these things. .... We should be modeling what we're talking about. So it shouldn't just be two teachers going it should be a parent and a teacher.

Summary

Principals were not involved with the initiation phase of CBIC. CBIC was generated by top-level administrators in the four agencies. The top-level administrators then delegated the responsibility of initiation and implementation to front line staff workers, and believed that these workers would have first-hand information and be better able to discover better ways of working together. Principals, as middle managers, were not notified about CBIC until some of the principals were

told to designate a member of his/her staff to serve on the teams. Principals also did not serve on the teams. Middle managers in the other four agencies were likewise excluded from the initiation phase of CBIC. Some principals were unhappy that all the schools were not included in CBIC from the beginning. Additionally, some principals were dissatisfied with the lack of direction given team members and the lack of additional school staff time allocated to the project.

Implementation

Four themes emerged concerning the principal's role in the community-based interagency collaboration effort during the implementation phase of the project. As mentioned previously, all the principals received a directive from the school district office to appoint a staff member to the team, of which some of them complied. The principals responded to the implementation of the project by (a) ignoring the project, (b) offering encouragement and support, (c) interacting with the neighborhood team members, and (d) concentrating increased efforts on improving and coordinating the school's internal environment. The link with CBIC was vague or nonexistent in all but the third theme, where some principals made attempts to directly contact team members. However, principals still tended to use individual team members as opposed to viewing CBIC as a "team".

Ignored the project. Even after the directive to appoint a staff member to the team (given about one year after the project was initiated), three principals continued to ignore the project (including one which ignored a request for an interview). Prior to the directive, five of the principals ignored the project (Field Notes, Oversight Committee, June, 1993). Two of those five had not heard of the project. One of those five chose not to have his staff participate because he was unable to release him from

school duties to serve on the teams. The social worker at this school also had concerns about confidentiality and the unclear goals of the team. Hence, he felt uncomfortable participating.

Offered encouragement and support. Principals offered support in five ways. First, principals who did send staff to participate did so with verbal encouragement and support, and allowed the team member full discretion over use of time/schedule to be on the teams, as well as to accomplish necessary tasks at the school site. In fact, one principal went so far as to request that their staff person be allowed to participate on the teams before the directive was issued. She stated:

> That's something that bothers me. [Another school representative originally assigned to the team] became the school representative and held that very tightly to himself for a long time. The only reason that the social worker here was able to go was that I called [a central office administrator] and said,'Why couldn't she go?' And, he said there was no reason, so I asked her if she would go and she started going. So, I think that was not a good situation.

Second, principals were also supportive of CBIC at other meetings, like administrative staff meetings. One principal was especially enthusiastic about his behind-the-scenes participation:

> I have acted like an advocate. I have been supportive of CBIC at other meetings, like administrative staff meetings. CBIC has made a chance for administrators to look at things differently versus doing the same thing all the time. It has encouraged them to try other things and be innovative. CBIC may forge something no one has thought of before and someone may have an insight and this could give energy and then we're off!

Third, principals and staff used information obtained through CBIC meetings. Team representatives brought back information to the school and shared pertinent pieces of information at weekly building meetings or weekly pupil services meetings, although principals were not always sure which information came from CBIC.

One principal explained:

> We really have two forums where we would share, one being our weekly building team meeting where we talk about specific kids, and again, she [school social worker] is in that meeting and she may contribute something and I don't say, ' Where did you find that out? And she may in fact have found it out through this [CBIC]. And then we also have what we call pupil services meetings which is meant to be more administrative type things where we might talk about this type of program for example.

Fourth, one principal discussed at length the need for principals to provide support and encouragement through leadership by example. For instance, by engaging in other collaborative efforts with the community, that behavior encouraged the collaborative efforts of staff. He explained:

> My present role is one of leadership by example. What I mean by that is that by our hosting a meeting of [another city planning initiative] here [at the school] talking about the building from blueprint form on the community center at [a nearby neighborhood]. [Our school] is the place where we do these meetings.

Finally, principals also supported obtaining financial support for team representatives (equivalent to their regular hourly salary) for summer employment. Summer projects, such as a summer enrollment drive and a summer reading program, were planned by team members and principals. A principal instrumental in the enrollment drive explained:

> [Here] is one logistical change that we are looking at making next fall as far as our registration. We get a lot of families moving in from out of town [or state]. [Out of state] schools normally don't start till after Labor Day, so they will move in and not have a clue where the schools are, when we start, how to enroll, what to do when they enroll. So number one, they come late, they get up here late after we have already gone through our registration process, they come in [and] they don't have the information they need. They very often have difficulty filling out the registration forms. What we are going to do is to put together in essence a registration packet that has kind of everything you ever wanted to know from dates to what you need to here's the form and we are going to give it to [the neighborhood social worker] so that when he becomes aware of a

> family moving in he can sit down with them and go through all of this information, help them fill out the forms so that when they come up here, they are ready to go rather than coming up here, being frustrated, not being able to enroll because they don't have the right forms or .....no adult [with the student].

However, front line staff usually requested the funding from top-level administrators once ideas were generated. School personnel also needed funding to continue their attendance at team meetings in the summer.

Interacted with neighborhood team members (residents and nonresidents). Principals interacted with neighborhood team members, using both direct and indirect links with CBIC. Principals increased the amount of direct contact they had with community residents through the team. As one principal said: "It was very difficult to figure out who's in charge [in the community], who do you contact, who are the 'go to' people in the neighborhood and there was quite a bit of turnover. It seemed to change and so once we get this structured, you know I hope there is some continuity."

Some of the principals independently called the social worker assigned to the neighborhood team about issues this social worker would not have dealt with before. For example, one principal knew of a student who had transferred from another school to the principal's school. The principal called the neighborhood social worker and neighborhood "beat cop", who knew about the family and this student. The two team members checked up on the student and the student enrolled and attended school that same day. In the past, social services did not have time to attend to truancy cases, and the school social worker (if the school had that luxury) had been traditionally tied to the school and had been less available to the neighborhood. As a result, the student could have remained at home, for literally weeks without anyone attending to his/her school attendance.

Principals also contacted the public health nurse assigned to the neighborhood, finding a direct and faster link to share the health problems of students. The nurse, like the social worker, also assisted in some truancy issues. In fact, principals who maintained direct contact with team members applauded the increased accessibility of those services. Principals did, however, tend to use individuals on the team versus viewing and using the team as a "team".

At the macro level, the principals worked with the entire team in both neighborhoods to coordinate the school enrollment drive (and a summer reading program) prior to the start of school, this alerted new residents (e.g., moving in from larger urban cities) to the school starting date prior to Labor Day (when school traditionally started in their old community), and helped them complete enrollment forms. Principals also participated in planning meetings at the neighborhood center to accommodate a federally funded recreation program, targeted in the two neighborhoods that housed both teams. CBIC team members, both residents and front-line staff, also participated in these planning meetings.

An indirect link involved two principals who had begun to hold separate parent meetings within the community itself. All front line staff team members attended these meetings as peripheral observers. The link with CBIC was indirect, but information gleaned from the meetings were discussed and used at team meetings when addressing residents' concerns about school. One principal discussed these meetings:

> R: Well, we've met with the team members and tried to set up some kind of meeting once a month with the neighborhood person that's in charge of the neighborhood community centers and trying to get some programs started in terms of monthly meetings, talking about their concerns or even having parents sit at the neighborhood center and talk about their concerns about the school and try to have them give us some input.

Q: So, you're going in the community to have these meetings?

R: Yes, but it's not been real successful. But, there it goes back again to trust.

Q: So, you are seeing as part of your role possibly breaking traditional barriers such as staying within the school and getting out into the community to make those connections?

R: I think that's the only way you can do it.

Both principals viewed these meetings also as an opportunity to give input about what was educationally sound to families and ideas on how to effectively parent their children. Principals also had the opportunity, usually with the help of staff that they brought along, to provide ideas for resources to both the parents and the CBIC.

One of the principals called the meetings " Issues Meetings". At the end of the school year, school personnel and residents held a social get-together at the neighborhood center. Residents were pleased that school personnel had made the effort to leave their building for meetings, even if nothing drastic had changed because of the meetings. The same principal found an associated increase in the amount of time parents from this neighborhood volunteered their time at the school to assist students. He explained:

> There was a conflict between students and we met with a group of parents and the parents really came through some problem solving and um we've seen them, parents, that volunteered to come into school just to be present to assist students, be at school, so there's kind of a very responsive constructive route to go to solve, you know, two adolescents in conflict. I think that's a result of people that are resources in the community.

In sum, principals attempted to remove barriers between the school and community by conducting meetings with residents at the neighborhood centers, where residents' concerns about school were discussed. The effort represented an indirect link with CBIC. Direct links between the principal and CBIC included (a) increasing

the amount of direct contact with residents via team members, (b) independently calling neighborhood team members for assistance in areas such as truancy and health issues, and (c) working with team members (and other initiatives which also involved CBIC) to plan macro projects which were related to the school.

Improving and coordinating the school's internal environment. The fourth major role the principal reported they performed was not linked with CBIC. Principals who discussed improving the internal environment of the school had difficulty articulating how they would use the CBIC, nor could they identify any specific links between their school goals and the work of the teams. Principals believed that their school climate would become more positive as a result of services that were more coordinated, including an increased number of staff involved in the community. The belief dovetailed well with the continuing goal of all the principals; to continue to improve the school's climate and culture. As one principal noted:

> There's hopefully a feeling of trust that has built up that there's a school and ultimately me as the leader of the school we're conveying an image of acceptance and caring, sensitivity, I think I could go down the line on student success stories where we started out with kids you know some kids being disengaged and you know not attending, being suspended and I'd like to think that we've reduced the number of student suspensions..... I think there are some cultural things we need to work on. We try and emphasize [the school] has a place for everyone and there's some common ideas and core values about the school so that people learn and so that it's a friendly place to learn. .....I would like to think that our school climate as a result of services that are coordinated and staff more involved in the community would go up, would be more positive.

Some principals tried to include more residents to participate within the school building itself. Encouraging parent volunteers to be hall monitors, for example, or inviting outside people who were the influential or informal leaders in the community to

eat lunch at school were two ideas. Attending important events in the community was another avenue to build bridges between the school and community employed by some principals.

Some principals, especially one, believed that their primary job was to coordinate other programs that were operating in the school, such as the breakfast program, full day kindergarten, and other non-profit agency programs. Coordinating these services was viewed as a way to again reduce fragmentation and duplication of services within the school. However, this role really had no link to CBIC. He explained:

> My role has been that of delegating--sending people to the team. I believe my role lies in keeping CBIC in line with other initiatives so that they don't duplicate or waste resources. My job is to coordinate other programs that are operating in my school.

Principals also assisted in helping to change school procedures to better accommodate the community. Initiatives such as providing bus transportation to school meetings for parents, providing bus transportation to enable children to stay for after-school activities, conducting parent-teacher conferences within residents' homes instead of at school, and tutoring programs held at the center were examples.

In sum, principals attempted to improve school climate and culture by inviting and including more residents to participate within the school building itself. School procedures were also changed by some principals to better accommodate the community, including busing and home parent-teacher conferences. However, some principals still viewed their primary role as one of coordinating activities within the school, and the avoidance of the duplication or waste of resources. Principals,

especially, who held this view had difficulty articulating how they would use the CBIC, nor could they identify any specific links between their school goals and the work of the teams.

Implementation-Summary

Four major themes were revealed concerning the principal's role in the CBIC during the implementation phase of the project. Although more active in this phase than in initiation, principals still predominantly held a peripheral role in CBIC. The four themes were that they (a) ignored the project, (b) offered encouragement and support, (c) interacted with the neighborhood team members, and (d) concentrated increased

efforts on improving and coordinating the school's internal environment. How principals foresaw their role in the future will be the subject of the next section.

Principal's Role in the Future

Principals struggled with how the school should "fit" into CBIC other than to offer encouragement and support and interact with team members. One principal's explanation revealed this confusion regarding not only their role, but the role of the school:

> I think that if there were more [WG] children who came here, then I think it would be very important that I know the community and the community knows something about me and that we have some opportunities to be together and the PTO is not the way to do it. So, maybe through CBIC, I could get hooked up with a group and we could work on something together, do something--so that when issues arose, they would have some history that said, 'Oh, she's the woman that did this with us', rather than, 'She's the so and so who's sending these kids home.' So, I guess that's part of how I would see maybe the way this person, the school representative, in this is in part a public relations kind of job. It's [like] the officer on the beat, he/she does crime prevention and does things related to policing, but another really important thing is that he/she is the manifestation of the police department and if people feel like this is an

> OK person, they feel differently about the police and so would that be true of someone related to the school district? I don't see myself as the public relations person, but I would see myself some how or another connected to the group in some meaningful way. Right now, this is a real struggle to know how we fit into this.

When principals discussed their future role with CBIC, responses tended to be vague and usually resulted in statements that referred to how principals have traditionally done business within the school building itself. Whether this was due to a lack of training for principals in collaborative leadership or shared decision making with other agencies, a lack of direction from top-level administrators, a belief that schools should really function within the confines of the school building, or the fact that principals were just too overwhelmed to be directly involved was unclear at this point. What was clear was that principals did not see themselves as attending team meetings. As one principal stated:

> I don't see myself working with CBIC people, but that might be the conduit through which I went to get hooked up with somebody. You see, I see this day care issue as something that I would really personally and professionally like to be involved in. I'm sure there are other principals who have other issues and I think that's how you start out--by coming together and helping something get done so you have some basis or some relationship with people.

Principals viewed themselves in basically two different ways about their future role in CBIC. First, some principals saw themselves as becoming more of an active participant. Active participation, however, usually meant conducting their own outreach efforts, with CBIC as just one of many efforts to improve school-community relationships. Second, other principals preferred to continue to concentrate their efforts on coordinating programs that existed within the building. Mention of a direct and ongoing link with CBIC was nonexistent.

Active participant outside of school. Principals discussed four ways in which they could be actively involved outside of the school, with only the last example connected to CBIC specifically. First, some principals discussed the continued need to remove barriers in the community so that the schools could operate more effectively with students. Principals saw themselves as being a leader in creating the setting so that people could work effectively together. One explained:

> My role is to remove what perceived barriers are out there in the community as to working with the schools, working in a collaborative type of measure to remove those. Set it up and get out of the way. What I'd like to see my role as is to become a very active participant. Not as 'the' principal but as a concerned citizen who happens to be the principal.

Second, principals also saw themselves as being actively involved (not necessarily with CBIC) by providing resources to the community. One principal stated:

> I see my role as a high school principal as being able to give some input in terms of how to deal with the kids and in terms of providing some resources for parents and the committee to deal with the court system, with the drug and alcohol systems that they have here in the community.

Third, some principals viewed themselves in a teaching role for parents and teachers. Specifically, one principal voiced a concern that parents needed some inservicing to learn how to communicate effectively with systems or staff. On the other hand, the staff also needed increased understanding about issues of diversity and training in how to deal with angry, overburdened parents. The same principal referred to teaching people how to treat each other the way they would like to be treated as creating "human relationship specialists". He noted:

> People can sense it in your voice whether you've got time to deal with them or not. That's a very, very critical issue in terms of teaching people how to treat people. Now, on the opposite hand, you've got to teach people in those communities how to talk to somebody. I can see how people have short fuses, but in my role as a principal, I can't get upset with parents. .....But [staff] don't

> understand the frustration a person has gone through. And, I think we've got to be better listeners rather than flying off the handle. That's a hard one to teach. .....Then the other thing is that parents are demanding. .....I grew up where my mother say "It's the way you hold your mouth". To me, you come in demanding and I don't care who you are, you're not going to get much. ....We don't teach that anymore. Our kids come in with the same attitude. "Give me this" or Give me that." They don't say thank-you. See, I think that's where we're missing a lot of our structure in terms of what I feel is educational too.

Another principal echoed this need to teach skills, previously considered beyond the traditional educational realm. "There are a lot of kids raising kids themselves. They raise one issue after the other and they are all convoluted. They have few skills. We need a wholistic approach. It is so time-consuming."

Fourth, one principal viewed CBIC as a clearinghouse of services, which the school [principals and staff] could tap into when needed. He noted:

> I think it's a community model of services and then anybody else that has ideas, then you would try and tap into the existing structure rather than creating a new structure, because then it does get fragmented.

It is interesting to note that the link with CBIC was unclear, with the exception of the last example. Although principals discussed the need for community involvement, they were unable to articulate the role of CBIC or their involvement.

Taking care of business within the school. Some principals clung to the notion that their future role should still involve the coordination of activities within their building rather than linking directly with (and in) the community. Although one principal referred to the need to possibly change that role in the future, she was unable to articulate how that role might change. She stated:

> I think that this [coordinating other programs with CBIC that operate in the school] is what my role should be. I will modify my role as conditions change. I do like the whole idea of empowerment, as the job is far bigger than what the school or I can deal with by ourselves.

In sum, direct links with CBIC and the principal were very limited and principals had difficulty articulating how the school should be linked to CBIC in the future. Hence, their limited involvement appears to be a function of confusion about what the school's and their role should be in regard to such a collaboration effort. Principals did discuss their active involvement with community outreach efforts, but CBIC was only peripherally linked to the efforts initiated by principals.

Principals' Responses and Initiatives

This last section will address how principals responded to or initiated change and then how principals believed the school should change in the future in relation to community-based collaboration efforts.

Principals' Beliefs Regarding Change to Date

Organizational change. Most organizational change within the schools as a result of CBIC has occurred with the job responsibilities of the school social workers. Initially, school social workers were given the directive to attend team meetings and verbal encouragement to attend meetings by principals. However, the school social worker's job responsibilities were not altered at the school site. After the project had been a little over a year old, central office administration began to receive some pressure from the top-level administrators of the three other agencies involved with the project to increase school staff time for the project. The need to increase staff time was also echoed by front line staff and some principals. The other three agencies had increased their staff time, with social services entirely changing the job description for the social worker and hiring one additional person to serve on the teams in each neighborhood. The school was criticized for "dragging their feet" and not allocating

the same amount of resources for the project (Field Notes, Oversight Committee, October, 1993). Central office administrators, then, requested and obtained from the board additional money to hire one extra full time school social worker to serve half time in each neighborhood. Although principals have also initiated some organizational changes (e.g., devoting more time doing community outreach activities, focusing on greater attention to multicultural curriculum options, and initiating more parent involvement in the schools via volunteers with tutoring and hall monitoring), the extent to which CBIC shaped these is unclear or only loosely connected.

Cultural changes. Several cultural changes, indirectly or directly linked with CBIC, were noted by principals. An increased sense of hope and optimism, especially by pupil service staff and principals, were mentioned.

> I think probably that the future could be in this group [CBIC].....This group is more approachable than social services. We have a name and we have a face and we don't get told 'there's nothing we can do for you'. That's also a function of this individual [the social worker]. I think it's important to recognize that she is very approachable and she does stuff. She goes and finds kids and brings them.

The other cultural change as a result of CBIC was a change in attitudes of both the school and parents. One principal explained:

> I think we just all recognize the need much more clearly than we did.... We've always seen ourselves as needing to first and foremost establish relationships with kids and families if we are ever going to teach anybody anything, and that is one reason we are not organized in the traditional sense [the school went to a house concept with pupils having the same teachers for three years].....So at any rate what I'm trying to say is those values and that philosophy have always been there. But before there wasn't this sense of urgency that we must get out, we must also reach out into the community.

Principals also noted a change of attitude in the school's willingness to open lines of communication due to the reciprocal attitudes of the other agencies to do the same. Principals then linked this to the old Indian adage that it takes a whole community to raise a child, one saying:

> Linking our school people with the staff in the neighborhood, there's a kind of a line of communication that makes sense and I see that as the biggest benefit. You know, you hear a lot about the cliche statement of partnerships and it takes a coordinated service to raise a child--you know, an entire village to raise a child, and to me [CBIC] is kind of an actualization of that idea.

Finally, one principal said, "I do believe that there has been a greater effort to understand issues of diversity than there used to be." However, that principal also believed that any current success was a "result of a combination of efforts." Again, the link with CBIC was vague or nonexistent.

A change in parents' attitudes was also noted by principals. Again, a direct cause-effect relationship between CBIC and the attitude change was confounded by other initiatives aimed at helping families that were occurring simultaneously with CBIC. However, one principal believed that the amount of her parent contacts had increased, explaining:

> They [parents] called me a lot more freely this year than ever before. It wasn't just me calling them. Lots of times one would call and ask for help or say we are having this trouble with my son who is in high school or elementary school [another school], what do you think I can do? A lot more of that kind of informal [communication], a lot more drop-ins. Sometimes it drove me nuts . They'd come in and just sit and say we got to talk to her when she is free.

Principals also believed that parents were feeling more comfortable with the school. One principal stated:

> I think we are becoming like real people to them too. By being out there and them knowing that we're really there to support them. We are not there for

> any other reasons than to help their kids be more successful. And I think they started to believe it because they got to know us, a little bit.

Building a sense of empowerment, principals believed, emanated from both school and neighborhood-based efforts. Regarding neighborhood efforts, one principal shared the following:

> I think what's starting to happen too is there are a group of parents down there [community] that have felt more empowered because they have networked and they've got some groups going.....I think many of them are feeling like some sense of importance or empowerment too is making a big difference in how they raise their kids.

Finally, another principal related a specific incident when the school team representative, the school parent liaison and the principal met with a group of parents in the community. The children of these parents were also involved in the meeting. The children were a group of girls who were in constant conflict and the principal suspended some of them, which made the parents angry. Therefore, school personnel arranged this meeting at the center to inform and involve the parents. The principal related the event:

> Well, lo and behold, the parents got real involved. It was very interesting and they started saying things to me like they heard those girls yell and holler at each other sitting right there in the center. They said,'Is this what you girls are doing at school?' You know, that kind of thing and the girls would say, 'Well, yeah'. The [parents] couldn't stand it either so then they became very supportive of what we were trying to do and agreed that anytime there were issues like that, I think we only had to do it a couple, three times, and those girls really settled in and started to [do OK]. I mean it is not only that factor but I think once the parents sort of saw what we were intending and took some ownership and wanted to be involved with the problem-solving and the kids knew that they were supporting us, I mean that is a classic example. I think you can improve communication and the parents understand what the real issues are and don't see you as somebody who is just trying to get on their kids. So we saw lots of cases like that of parents, I think, really understanding that we care about them and their kids.....I think they just became more comfortable.

Although the entire team was not involved, the school did borrow the concept of moving the site of the meeting to the neighborhood to accommodate the parents. Additionally, the presence of the school team member in the community, with the team member's knowledge of the people in the community, probably was an important factor in their ability to arrange and hold the meeting.

Principals' Beliefs Regarding Future Change

As was the case found in the data on the future role of the principal, principals had a very difficult time discussing any direct links with CBIC in the future. Instead, principals again tended to dwell on initiatives that they would like to see occur within their school or initiatives about outreach which would emanate from the school. CBIC was then viewed as just one of a variety of ongoing efforts to improve conditions for students at-risk.

Other principals viewed CBIC as an extension of the school that helped to plan joint programs in the community. Ideas included job shadowing, employing residents, dealing with homework, and organizing more effective child care. As one principal pointed out:

> I think the other things that would come out of this very logically is better child care, better day care, better after kinds of options in the neighborhood that could be an extension of the school. And, we run after school programs here. .....We could employ people in the community to do that. We could do job shadowing first and then... turn it over to them. .....I just can't understand why [various organizations, including CBIC] couldn't get together with some folks in the community and come up with some organized child care/day care things. That would be very beneficial--homework things, friend things and so on. It would get kids out of the apartments and it would get them off the streets.

Relatedly, many principals hoped that the communication between the school and residents would continue to increase, as revealed by this principal's statement:

> The people of the community and the school could sort of begin to talk some of the same language and we might be able to build better trust and some better cooperation that would not feel so defensive and parents would not have to feel sometimes that they have to be on the offense to be heard.

Another principal advocated for the extension of work hours beyond the traditional work day for pupil service staff, so that these individuals could more effectively operate on the teams. As he noted:

> What is so magical about 7:45 to 4:00? That's when we're going to do our assistance with students. Maybe that extends beyond that time and it's more evening work.

Finally, one principal indicated that CBIC would be included in his school's goals for the next year, saying:

> Some of the goals we set up for next year you know will include saying we're going to do some things with CBIC as we allocate what the social workers time is going to be spent doing.

Although this statement appeared to indicate a direct link with CBIC, the principal could not articulate what specific goals would be generated which involved CBIC.

Principals voiced the need to increase inservice and staff development so that their staff would understand CBIC and were aware of its existence and purpose. One noted:

> I think that too, the school people have to know. You know we need to do more inservicing, more staff development, more information will need to be shared with our people so that they understand how this program is designed, how it works, what it's supposed to do. Because it is new, I mean I think it's a major shift in the paradigm of how things are done.

Principals explained the need to build better communication in the future between the community and school that might result in better public relations. One principal stated this sentiment, and went further by saying that he hoped CBIC would assist the school in creating a more positive school image to the community and increasing the school's access to the community. The hope, then, would be a translation of these positive attitudes into school achievement. She stated:

> I'd like to think that it's increased our access.....it's increased the image of a more positive image about this school. We're certainly not any where we'd like to be but I think that there's just more people working in the same direction....I think it helps us out. Ultimately, what I would be interested in as a school person is that this translates to school achievement, improved learning in the classroom. That if health needs are covered, if social service issues are dealt within the family, if there's an appropriate line of talk between the service providers and the community and the school then this makes kids more ready and more capable to learn and then we see the benefits of that with greater achievement performance at school..... It is the line of communication that CBIC helps to set up that makes sense.

Summary

The most organizational change as a result of CBIC, to date, has been the change in the job responsibilities of the school social workers and the addition of a school social worker to work half-time in each neighborhood. The largest cultural change has involved an increased recognition of the urgency to reach out in the community, assist in developing a better "sense of community" in and outside of school, and the need to better understand issues of diversity. Additionally, an increased sense of hope and optimism and a positive change in the attitudes of both parents and school personnel were noted. In relationship to CBIC, but not necessarily as a result of the project, principals discussed the need to devote greater attention to multicultural curriculum options and to initiate more parent involvement in schools.

Principals had difficulty articulating future direct links with CBIC, and discussed more efforts that they planned to initiate from or within the school. Some principals did want to assume a more active outreach role in the future, while other principals preferred to focus their efforts within the school building.

Conclusions

Principals recognized that CBIC was a top-down directive with front line staff given the mission of implementation of the project. As middle managers, principals were not involved in the project's initiation and were peripheral in the project's implementation. In fact, this was true of the middle managers in all of the agencies involved with CBIC.

Principals were basically supportive of the project being housed in the community, with some principals who believed that a school-based effort would need to precede a successful community-based effort. Four major themes emerged about the principal's role in the community-based collaboration effort. The four major themes were that principals (a) ignored the project, (b) offered encouragement and support, (c) interacted with neighborhood team members, and (d) improved and coordinated the school's internal environment.

The most organizational change as a result of CBIC, to date, has been the change in the job responsibilities of the school social workers and the addition of a school social worker to work half-time in each neighborhood. The largest cultural change has involved an increased recognition of the urgency to reach out in the community, assist in developing a better 'sense of community' in and outside of school, and the need to better understand issues of diversity. Additionally, an increased sense

of hope and optimism and a positive change in the attitudes of both parents and school personnel were noted. In relationship to CBIC, but not necessarily as a result of the project, principals discussed the need to devote greater attention to multicultural curriculum options and to initiate more parent involvement in schools.

Future links with CBIC were either vague or nonexistent. A major theme of this paper involved principals' inability to articulate the link between CBIC and the schools. Some principals admitted their confusion with how the schools should "fit into" CBIC. Other principals, especially while discussing future roles and future school change related to the project, primarily used rhetoric gleaned from effective schools, school-community relations and community education research. It was unclear if principals did not have sufficient training in collaborative leadership and/or shared decision-making with other agencies, if principals did not have sufficient direction from top-level administrators or front line staff, if principals preferred to maintain the way they had traditionally operated, or if principals were too overwhelmed to divert much of their energy to the project directly. Hence, principals focused on how to develop better community outreach from the school or how to improve their school's climate via better communication strategies, better instruction, and increased staff development on issues of diversity and multicultural education.

A marked contrast existed between the principals' role in community-based versus school-based collaboration. In accounts of school-based collaboration, principals were directly involved with the projects because they were housed within the school. Balancing the project with other school initiatives often presented the principal with conflicts and problems, especially those of creating change while simultaneously maintaining some stability within the building. Principals were not

caught in this "double-bind" in the community-based effort. If anything, some principals were offended that they were not included more in the project. With CBIC housed in the community, the principal could be flexible about how he/she would be involved and at the same time, not primarily responsible for the success of CBIC's efforts.

It does seem clear that professors involved with educational administration preparation should begin to include in their curriculum some information about collaborative leadership and shared decision-making with other agencies. Students could also begin to generate ideas as to how they could use and be involved with collaborative efforts once they obtain jobs in the field. Additionally, future principals might require increased exposure to more nontraditional paradigms of theory that would allow them to be more flexible in their thinking and actions.

CBIC does appear to provide an opportunity to create a direct link with troubled neighborhoods, traditionally alienated from bureaucracies such as the school. In cities where children come to the same school from many different neighborhoods, schools could also seize this chance to create a sense of community by forming direct links with CBIC. They could coordinate all the different schools' and agencies' efforts that are involved with a particular neighborhood.

CBIC also has the potential to create another avenue for the principal to assume a leadership role outside of the school--a new type of outreach to neighborhoods. Rather than the principal performing these outreach efforts alone or only with their school staff, CBIC could provide support and easier entry into distrustful neighborhoods. Principals could build off of the rapport and trust that may emanate from team members housed in the neighborhood, and work with families in a

preventive, proactive fashion. However, this may mean that the principal will need to trade their invisibility for a more active, visible role in regard to community-based interagency collaboration. Principals not only need to inform and advocate for staff participation, but also need to make themselves visible in neighborhoods and involved with project initiatives that emanate from CBIC. CBIC could provide a format to assist in the accomplishment of the large task of school reform.

References

Behrman, R. E. (Ed.). (1992). The future of children, 2. The Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Bolman, L. G. & Deal, T. E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1993). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. American Journal of Education, 101, 140-179.

Denton, W.H. (1987). Educational leadership in the community. The High School Journal, 70(4), 180-184.

Fullan, M. G. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1987). A child resource policy: Moving beyond dependence on school and family. Phi Delta Kappan, 68, 576-580.

Jehl, J., & Kirst, M. (1992). Getting ready to provide school-linked services: What schools must do. In Behrman, R. (Ed.). The future of children, 2, The Center for the Future of Children, The David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

Leiter, J. (1983). Perception of community dissatisfaction and school organizational structures. American Educational Research Journal, 20(1), 45-62.

Sarason, S.B. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Schorr, L. B. (1988). Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Smylie, M. A., Crowson, R.L., & Hare, V. C. (1992). The principal and school-level administration of coordinated children's services. Paper presented at the Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, MN.

Smylie, M. A., Crowson, R.L., & Hare, V.C. (1993). The principal and community-school connections in Chicago's radical reform. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Valverde, L. A. (1988). Principals creating better schools in minority communities. Education and Urban Society, 20(4), 319-326.

Zeldin, S. (1990). The implementation of home-school-community partnerships: Policy from the perspectives of principals and teachers. Equity and Choice, Spring, 56-63.